

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 22 and 24-42 remain in the application. Claims 22 and 24-42 are subject to examination.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 22, 24-35 and 37 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,920,505 to Hals et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,966,029 to Ahern and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,194,683 to Hind et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants believe the Examiner does not appreciate the difference between "server-based computing", which is the basis of the claimed invention, and "HTML-based transfer techniques" that are used for transferring web sites in the Internet. Applicants will therefore review the difference between server based computing and HTML-based transfer techniques.

Server-based computing:

The most essential difference between HTML technology and server-based computing is that, in server-based computing, an interactive application, such as for example, a database application, runs entirely self-sufficiently on the server computer designated hereinafter as "application server".

In this case, an interactive application program, for example, a database application runs entirely self-sufficiently on the application server, wherein the latter, figuratively expressed, lets the interactive application run in its own window, which is assigned to each client computer connected to the application server.

It is important in this case that the interactive application is executed independently on the application server, and the screen displays, computed by the application server, of the interactive application program, for example, a database input mask, in which various fields must be filled out, is also computed on the application server. This display is then transferred via a highly latent connection, for example a geostationary satellite connection, onto the client computer, which, contrary to a database application or a text processing application, such as Word, does not execute the application per se, but merely reproduces the screen displays computed by the application server via the respective graphic card on the screen. In this case, the client computer merely functions as a “dumb” terminal, whereas the application server executes the actual computing work, such as, for example, the sorting and converting of large data amounts into the database, which, naturally, occurs with a clearly higher speed than could be executed by a simple client computer.

In order to react to an input mask computed by the application server and transferred to the client as a screen display by inputting letters or numbers, an independent program routine takes place on the client computer as specified in

claim 22 as well as in the dependent claims. Expressed in simple terms, this independent program routine merely computes the movement of the cursor in the mask illustrated on the screen of the client computer and ensures that, for example, after the input of letters and a final command the latter are sent back in the form of further data packets to the application server. The latter, by means of the input commands and the newly entered data, executes, for example, a new sorting of the database.

In other words, by sending only a few letters of text and corresponding control commands, such as for example, an input command, the application server receives instructions with a certain delay via the highly latent connection. By means of these instructions, the application server computes a new screen display via the interactive application program, which screen is subsequently sent again to the client PC. The connection between the client computer and the application server is always maintained in this case, since the application program is, so to speak, remotely controlled on the application server via the client PC and the highly latent network connection.

HTML-Technology:

Contrary thereto, in the case of the HTML technology that known from the Internet, a web server is accessed via the web browser installed on the client computer and via a network connection by inputting a desired Internet address, for example, the page of an airline company, where an air journey is to be booked. A plurality of preset HTML pages generated beforehand is deposited

on the web server. The web server can be connected admittedly also with the database server, which manages the individual flight data, for example.

After selecting the corresponding web page, where, for example, the desired flight connections are listed, the web server sends the page contents in form of HTML code back, wherein, if applicable, also further independent program routines like Java scripts or the like can be contained, for example.

The source code sent to the client computer via the network connection is subsequently not interpreted, by the client computer, but rather by the browser, which runs on the client computer, and is converted into a screen display, which indicates the requested web page to the user. Even fields in the HTML illustration can admittedly be generated here from the Java scripts or Applets, which fields, without more detailed knowledge of the display technology, create the impression for the layman as if an interactive application, for example, a flight booking system completely runs on the server and only the displays on the client PCT are computed. This appears to be the main reason for the Examiner's misunderstanding.

However, the reality is that the connection between the client computer and the web server is interrupted after sending the entire HTML page. After the input of data into a data field of the displayed browser mask and clicking or inputting the "enter" command, this input mask is then interpreted by the browser, which means that the browser of the respective selection assigns a corresponding

URL address in the data field, the former then being sent again to the web server. The web server then deposits the HTML code of the requested web page from its internal database and sends it in the above-described manner again to the client computer. The browser of client computer interprets it and displays it on the screen of the client computer. After that, the connection is again interrupted.

Applicants want to emphasize once more at this point that, because of the system, HTML-based technology in reality does not render possible the operation of a pseudo-interactive application, such as for example a flight booking system, via a highly latent network. This is due to the fact that a latency period of, for example, 0.5 seconds by the return confirmations that are absolutely required for the transfer of HTML code, requires several minutes for each side without further measures even if several thousand data packets are combined in merely one large TCP-IP data packet prior to the transfer. It is understood that, in practice, one cannot speak of an interactive application if the wait period is several minutes after each input.

With regard to the teachings in Hals et al., Ahern, and Hind et al., applicants note that they all pertain to the exchange of HTML pages so that even in combination, they could not suggest the invention as defined by claim 22.

Applicants believe that one of ordinary skill in the art would not even consider the data processing technologies described in these references because they

are exclusively based on the transfer of HTML code, which, as explained above, excludes operation suitable in practice due to the substantial delay.

Since these three references all pertain to the exchange of HTML pages, one of ordinary skill in the art would not consider these references in connection with the acceleration of an interactive application program on an application server, in which the program is executed via a highly latent network connection.

Applicants will now briefly discuss the teachings in the cited references to emphasize that they do not relate to server based computing, but rather merely relate to HTML transfer techniques. Hals et al. pertains to a method or a device to detect a suitable navigation path for a visitor of a web page by means of a previously input direct or indirect search term or key word, and then offer it to the visitor. Hals et al. create a new Web page with several links on one web page due to the transferred direct or indirect search terms or keys. It is intended to supplement the result pages usually created by search engines in order to have more controlled access to the contents of a web page. For this purpose, additional web servers and database servers are used. In this case, the database server stores visitor information and already generated detailed navigation paths and transmits them via the web server. The invention of Hals et al. expands the result pages thus far generated by search engines to expanded navigation paths and links, which are specifically generated on web pages by means of transferred search terms and key words. For this purpose, a database, a web server, a communication network, as well as a client

computer system are required. The web pages thus created additionally are usual HTML pages, which have nothing to do with a window application performed on a server. This reference thus pertains to a refinement of previous search engine results.

The teaching in Ahern pertains to the integration and encryption of scripts (programs such as Java, Java script, VB script etc.) in electronic documents, mainly in HTML pages. The scripts can then process and format contents (text), which is also incorporated into an HTML page. A parser, which is additionally incorporated into a web browser, detects the encrypted code by means of special tags and then decodes it. The code can then be executed by the script processor (interpreter), which is also integrated. The invention in Ahern pertains to a technique, which permits the incorporation and encryption of a code into HTML pages. The code is then decoded in the browser and transferred to the script processor or interpreter. The code to be executed process or format the pages embedded into the HTML pages (render via CSS style sheets).

The teaching in Hind et al. pertains to the integration of dynamic data (from external data, SQL database source, XML data etc.) into an HTML page. Instead of integrating texts directly into an HTML page, they are first read by external sources and then formatted by means of HTML formatting commands (style sheets, XSLT etc.). Even embedded scripts can be activated (Java scripts, Java beans, etc.) in order to format the texts. Hind et al. pertains to a content management system that is customary nowadays (CMS), wherein

dynamic text contents are read by external sources and then formatted via HTML formatting commands, style sheets CSS, XSLT processors, or so-called templates.

Under the heading "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 13 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 36, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,920,505 to Hals et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,966,029 to Ahern in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,194,683 to Hind et al. and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0165993 to Kramer under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Even if there would have been a suggestion to combine the teaching in Kramer with that of Hals et al., Ahern and Hind et al., the invention as defined by claims 36, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42 would not have been obtained for the reasons given above with regard to claim 22 and the teachings in Hals et al., Ahern and Hind et al.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 22. Claim 22 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 22.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 22 and 24-42 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of two months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$490.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Weichselbaum/
Mark P. Weichselbaum
(Reg. No. 43,248)

MPW:cgm

June 29, 2009

Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100;
Fax: (954) 925-1101